

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I support the Lautenberg amendment. And people say this is a States rights issue. I would remind everyone that Medicaid, a Federal program, pays for probably the great majority of the injuries that arise from excessive speed and terrible accidents.

So I hope that we will go forward with the speed limit as suggested by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, let me talk for a moment about the enforcement issue. Enforcement has always been local enforcement and State enforcement.

What this amendment is going to do is say, while we have a national standard, Congress is no longer—Washington is no longer—micromanaging the enforcement of it. This has always been local, and it will remain local. Predictions: I have only one prediction that I will make. While we cannot guess how many lives will be lost, the prediction is this: If this amendment does not pass, and if the bill goes into effect as written, the speed limits will go up and more people will die. That is what the facts are. That is what the evidence shows us. That is what history shows us. That is the bottom line of this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 269 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Akaka	Feingold	Lautenberg
Biden	Feinstein	Leahy
Bingaman	Ford	Levin
Bond	Glenn	Lieberman
Boxer	Gorton	Lugar
Bradley	Harkin	Mikulski
Breaux	Hatfield	Moseley-Braun
Bryan	Heflin	Moynihan
Bumpers	Hollings	Murray
Byrd	Inouye	Nunn
Chafee	Jeffords	Pell
Conrad	Johnston	Pryor
Daschle	Kassebaum	Reid
DeWine	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kerry	Simon
Exon	Kohl	Wellstone

NAYS—49

Abraham	Graham	Packwood
Ashcroft	Gramm	Pressler
Baucus	Grams	Robb
Bennett	Grassley	Roth
Brown	Gregg	Santorum
Burns	Hatch	Shelby
Campbell	Helms	Simpson
Coats	Hutchison	Smith
Cochran	Inhofe	Snowe
Cohen	Kempthorne	Specter
Coverdell	Kyl	Stevens
Craig	Lott	Thomas
D'Amato	Mack	Thompson
Dole	McCain	Thurmond
Domenici	McConnell	Warner
Faircloth	Murkowski	
Frist	Nickles	

So the amendment (No. 1427) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senate will now proceed to a rollcall vote on the Lautenberg amendment. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1428, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, in the unanimous-consent agreement that we had before, it said that I would have an opportunity to send a technical modification of the amendment to the desk, and I do that, and then the vote will take place.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, we have no objection to the modification, and I move to table the Lautenberg amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order, the amendment will be so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 28, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 1. POSTING OF MAXIMUM SPEED LIMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 154 of title 23, United States Code (as amended by section 115), is further amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

"§ 154. National maximum speed limit";

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking "(b) MOTOR VEHICLE.—In this section, the" and inserting the following:

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) MOTOR VEHICLE.—The"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) PASSENGER VEHICLE.—The term 'passenger vehicle' means any vehicle driven or drawn by mechanical power manufactured primarily for use on public highways (except any vehicle operated exclusively on a rail or rails) that is not a motor vehicle."; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(g) POSTING OF SPEED LIMITS FOR PASSENGER VEHICLES.—The Secretary shall not approve any project under section 106 in any State that has failed to post a speed limit for passenger vehicles in conformance with the speed limits required for approval of a project under subsection (a), except that a State may post a lower speed limit for the vehicles."

(b) CERTIFICATION.—The first sentence of section 141(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "with respect to motor vehicles, and posting all speed limits on public highways in accordance with section 154(g) with respect to passenger vehicles".

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 154 and inserting the following:

"154. National maximum speed limit."

Mr. NICKLES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to table has been made. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 1428, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 270 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Abraham	Feingold	Mack
Akaka	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Baucus	Graham	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bingaman	Grams	Nunn
Bond	Grassley	Packwood
Breaux	Gregg	Pressler
Brown	Hatch	Reid
Bryan	Helms	Robb
Burns	Hutchison	Roth
Campbell	Inhofe	Santorum
Coats	Inouye	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Simpson
Cohen	Johnston	Smith
Conrad	Kassebaum	Snowe
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Specter
Craig	Kerry	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
Dole	Leahy	Thompson
Domenici	Lott	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lugar	

NAYS—35

Biden	Ford	Mikulski
Boxer	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Harkin	Moynihan
Bumpers	Hatfield	Murray
Byrd	Heflin	Pell
Chafee	Hollings	Pryor
Daschle	Kennedy	Rockefeller
DeWine	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Simon
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Warner
Exon	Levin	Wellstone
Feinstein	Lieberman	

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 1428), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15.

Thereupon, at 1:01 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:13 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KYL).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

THE FOSTER NOMINATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, yesterday, the majority leader met with Dr. Henry Foster, President Clinton's nominee for Surgeon General. After that meeting, he proposed a cloture vote on the nomination to take place at some point in the near future.

While I am pleased about this progress, the proposed cloture vote is

only the first step to clearing the way for a real vote on the floor. Supporters and opponents alike who agree that Dr. Foster deserves a vote by the entire Senate, will vote to invoke cloture, so that we can finally give this nomination the fair vote it deserves.

Cloture is a step on the road to fairness, but it is only the first step. I hope that my colleagues will vote to invoke cloture, giving us the opportunity to take the second step—the step that counts—the up-or-down vote on the nomination by the entire Senate.

Throughout this nominations process, several Republicans have stated that, in fairness, the nomination should go before the entire Senate for a final vote. Some Members have suggested that by allowing a cloture vote, the majority leader will be giving the nomination the fair consideration it deserves. They have suggested that a vote on cloture is the same as a vote on the nomination. Obviously, that is not the case.

I believe that some Senators who feel strongly about the issue of fairness intend to vote for cloture, even if they intend to vote against the nomination itself.

Although I disagree with their position on Dr. Foster, they at least agree that it is wrong to filibuster this nomination. They refuse to let a minority of the Senate block the will of the majority.

Dr. Foster is well qualified to be Surgeon General. He has endured this confirmation process with dignity and grace. He has fully and forthrightly answered all the questions raised, and he deserves to be confirmed. And if the Senate treats him fairly, I am confident he will be confirmed.

We all know what is going on here. Republican opponents of a woman's right to choose are filibustering this nomination because Dr. Foster, a distinguished obstetrician and gynecologist, participated in a small number of abortions during his long and brilliant career.

From the beginning, the only real issue in this controversy has been abortion. All the other issues raised against Dr. Foster have disappeared into thin air. They have no substance now, and they have never had any substance. Dr. Foster has dispelled all of those objections, and he has dispelled them beyond a reasonable doubt.

The only remaining question is whether Republicans who support a woman's constitutional right to choose will vote for their principles, or pander to the antiabortion wing of their party by going along with this unconscionable filibuster.

The vote will tell the story. If the Senate is fair to Dr. Henry Foster, this filibuster will be broken, and Dr. Foster will be confirmed as the next Surgeon General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I notice the Senator from Rhode Island is on

his feet. I was intending to seek unanimous consent to speak for a minute as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WELFARE REFORM

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, many of us are interested in the subject of welfare reform. I have now had an opportunity to hear a discussion of the scheduling that has been proposed for the Senate for the remainder of this week, next week, and in the weeks following the July 4 recess. I would say, as one Member of the Senate, I hope very much that we will see a welfare reform bill brought to the floor of the Senate by the majority party. We are ready, willing, and waiting to debate the welfare reform issue. We have produced, on the minority side, a welfare reform plan that we are proud of, one we think works, one we think will save the taxpayers in this country money, and one that will provide hope and opportunity for those in this country who are down and out and who need a helping hand to get up and off the welfare rolls and onto payrolls.

It is our understanding that the majority party, after having come to the floor for many, many months talking about the need and urgency for welfare reform, and their anxious concern about getting it to the floor, have run into a snag. They are off stride because they apparently cannot reach agreement in their own caucus on what constitutes a workable welfare reform plan that would advance the interests of this country.

We hope very much they find a way in their caucus to resolve their internal problems. Democrats have a welfare reform bill that will work, that is good for this country, and that we are ready to bring to the floor immediately. The question for them, I suppose, is what is wrong with the Republican welfare reform bill?

The problem Democrats see and the reason that we have constructed an alternative is that the welfare reform bill they are talking about, but apparently cannot yet agree on, is that it is not a bill about work. We believe that welfare reform must be more than a helping hand; it must also be about work.

In our bill, we call it Work First. We extend a hand of opportunity to those in need. Those who take advantage of the opportunities that this system gives them also have a responsibility. We will offer a helping hand. We will help you step up and out when you are down and out. You deserve a helping hand. But you have a responsibility in return. Your responsibility is to get involved in a program which will provide the training to lead to a job.

Welfare is not a way of life and cannot be a way of life. People have a responsibility. We are going to require them to meet that responsibility.

A good welfare reform bill is about work. The plan that has been proposed, but apparently not yet agreed to because of internal dissension in the other caucus, the caucus of the majority party, is unfortunately not about work. It is about rhetoric. It is about passing the buck. It is about saying let us send a block grant back to the States with no strings attached. If they require work, that maybe is OK. But they do not require work so their plan is not about work. It is about passing the buck. It is also not really about reform. It hands the States a pile of money and requires nothing, nothing of substance from them in return.

It does not protect kids. As we reform the welfare system, let us understand something about welfare. Two-thirds of the money we spend for welfare in this country is spent for the benefit of kids. No kids in this country should be penalized because they were born in circumstances of poverty. Welfare reform must still protect our children.

Finally, the proposal the majority party is gnashing its teeth about does nothing really to address the fundamental change that helps cause this circumstance of poverty in our country—teen pregnancy and other related issues. Their piece of legislation really takes a pass on those issues. We have to be honest with each other. We have to address the problem of teen pregnancy in a significant way.

The problem of teenage pregnancy is not going to go away. It does relate to poverty and it does relate to circumstances in which children live in poverty. The annual rate of unmarried teen mothers has doubled in this country in just one generation, and it continues to rise. There are a million teen births every year in this country now—1 million teen births, 70 percent of whom are not married. In fact, nearly 1 million children will be born this year who, during their lifetimes, will never learn the identity of their fathers. You cannot call a welfare reform plan true reform if it does not address that issue.

We hope we will soon see legislation on the floor of the Senate that is meaningful welfare reform legislation. Senator DASCHLE, Senator BREAU, Senator MIKULSKI, and others have helped construct a plan I am proud of—a plan that will work, a plan that says “work first,” a plan that will not punish children born in circumstances of poverty.

Now the question is, Where is the welfare debate? It has been postponed. Why? Because the majority party, so anxious to deal with welfare reform, now tells us for one reason or another, it is not on the horizon for the legislative calendar. I think that is a shame. I hope we will see it on the Senate agenda very soon.

Mr. President, if I might take 1 additional minute, not in morning business—on this bill?